

RECEIVED

JAN 11 2000

EIS002115

JUDY SHANKLE

1 MS. SHANKLE: I'm Judy Shankle, Mineral County affected unit of local government representative. Mineral County believes that a number of issues are not addressed properly, not addressed adequately or not addressed at all in the Draft EIS. The issues include but are not limited to impact on local government programs and costs.

MR. LAWSON: Ms. Shankle, I'm sorry to interrupt. Would somebody remind them outside that there's a hearing going on in here? Just tell them that we'd like to have the room for discussion. Okay. I'm sorry. Please, go ahead.

2 MS. SHANKLE: The DEIS does not adequately address specific community, local government, statewide and regional impacts. Rural counties do not have money to handle radioactive accidents. The cost to ensure that the rural counties would be able to accommodate the transportation of the radioactive waste would probably exceed the no action alternative, uncertainty used in models and data used for site characterization and repository performance.

3 Mineral County's flood plain map is incorrect. If this is so, how reliable is the information gathered for Yucca Mountain and other areas? The flood plain report in the DEIS is too general. Mineral County would like the EIS to contain a current and detailed flood plain analysis of Yucca Mountain in each affected county.

4 The statistics for the population and growth in Nevada is outdated. The population of places like Las Vegas, Reno, Carson City and Pahrump have significantly -- significantly increased. With the population increase has come an increase in Nevada's transportation system. Along with its increase has come an increase in accidents all over Nevada.

5 What precautions are being taken or safe havens being used, updated or built to ensure the safe transportation of the high-level radioactive waste? The EIS should contain this information using current data. The DEIS provides generic transportation analysis. Specific transcontinental routes and communities along the way are not identified. Other transportation issues of the waste to the site are: Mode, not clearly identified. Three possible modes of transportation are identified.

The waste could be driven on interstates using legal weight trucks. It could be sent by train, which includes five options of building a railroad to Yucca Mountain. It could be transported by heavy-haul, which is rail to a transfer point in Nevada, then transferred to 220 foot heavy-haul trucks and transported to Yucca Mountain. Routing, many possible routes not studied adequately. Rural areas do not have good or safe roads to transport this nuclear waste, especially if alternative routes are selected, nor do they have railroads to get it to Yucca Mountain. Land use. Consideration of present and planned land uses along possible routes identified.

6 Mineral County will be promoting tourism. One area of tourism is hiking and outdoor activities. Another consideration of Mineral County's plan would be to have a private prison in an area close to one of the possible routes.

8 Emergency response, training, preparedness and funding. Rural areas do not have the necessary equipment nor trained personnel to handle radioactive accidents. Terrorists, extremist threats, DOE has used old data to provide this information.

9... Casks. DOE will change the design of the casks which would be used to transport the high-level radioactive waste. The DEIS does not address whether the new design of the casks has been analyzed. When will the

- ...9 new casks be built and tested? What's the integrity of the valves, seals and shielding? Full scale cask testing is needed rather than computer simulations.
- 10 Weather and natural disasters. Although weather does not seem to be an issue, Mineral County believes it's a big issue. Most of the radioactive waste would be transported through the northern part of Nevada. This part of the state may have bad weather from November to May as well as many other states from east, central and northwest America. Will the radioactive waste be transported during their time frame? The DEIS does not have adequate information in case of road closures due to inclement weather, nor provide complete information about safe havens or alternate trucks and siting for rail.
- 11 On June 12th, 1994, Mineral County had an earthquake with a 6.0 magnitude. Even if Yucca Mountain
 15 would withstand a strong earthquake, what is being done to protect the transport of high-level nuclear waste during earthquakes, tornadoes and so on forth? Mineral County wants it put on record that the DEIS is inadequate with regard to addressing transportation. The DEIS should provide feasibility studies and impacts in a comprehensive and thorough analysis modes specific routes and emergency procedures in case a radioactive accident or natural disaster should occur. Transporting highly radioactive waste through forty-three states possibly affecting about fifty-three million people within one-half mile of the route is not prudent and would endanger the public and environment all along these routes.
- 12 The cost of clean-up at the Nevada Test Site and cost build new routes, rail or roads, cost to ensure
 16 precautions are being taken, cost to train emergency response staff and costs to clean up radioactive accidents would probably far exceed finding alternative ways to reuse this radioactive waste. The EIS has an inadequate analysis of the cost. It should include analysis of the eventuality of the waste at Yucca Mountain and funds to monitor it, costs of drip shields, backfill, lease and repair. Mineral County wants it put on record that health assessments at the cost of DOE should be done now of all ten affected counties. This assessment would reflect what is out there now. By showing the present health situations now, a case may be made for not having adding to potential number of latent cancer fatalities and for documenting current health conditions prior to radioactive waste accidents.
- 13 Mineral County believes that the radioactive waste should not be buried because there's no way mankind can predict what will happen in the future. Alternative ways should be studied so technology can find a way to reuse this radioactive waste. Burying something as deadly as radioactive waste does not solve any problems. If anything, it might create more. Mineral County will be submitting written comments by February 9th comment deadline.